CORNFIELD
INTERIM PUBLIC USE PLAN

FINAL
INITIAL STUDY
AND
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

July 2003

Prepared for the California Department of Parks and Recreation
Angeles District

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT: **CORNFIELD INTERIM PUBLIC USE PLAN (IPU)**

LEAD AGENCY: California Department of Parks and Recreation

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS: The Initial Study for this Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for review at:

- Southern Service Center
  California Department of Parks & Recreation
  8885 Rio San Diego Drive, Suite 270
  San Diego, California 92108
- Angeles District Headquarters
  California Department of Parks & Recreation
  1925 Las Virgenes Road
  Calabasas, California 91302
- City of Los Angeles Library
  Chinatown Branch
  536 W. College Street
  Los Angeles, CA 90012
- City of Los Angeles Library
  Central Library
  630 W. Fifth Street
  Los Angeles, CA 90071
- City of Los Angeles Library
  Echo Park Branch
  1410 W. Temple Street
  Los Angeles, CA 90026

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A copy of the Initial Study is attached. Questions or comments regarding this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration may be addressed to:

Tina Robinson, Environmental Coordinator
California Department of Parks and Recreation
Southern Service Center
8885 Rio San Diego Drive, Suite 270
San Diego, California 92108

Pursuant to Section 21082.1 of the California Environmental Quality Act, the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) has independently reviewed and analyzed the Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the proposed project and finds that these documents reflect the independent judgment of California State Parks. As lead agency, California State Parks also confirms that the project mitigation measures detailed in these documents are feasible and will be implemented as stated in the Negative Declaration.

TABLE of CONTENTS

Chapter/Section **Page**

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CALIFORNIA STATE PARKS) to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed Interim Public Use (IPU) Project at the Cornfield site in the Angeles District in Los Angeles County, California. This document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code §21000 *et seq*., and the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR) §15000 *et seq*.

An Initial Study (IS) is conducted by a lead agency to determine if a project may have a significant effect on the environment [CEQA Guidelines §15063(a)]. If there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15064(a). However, if the lead agency determines that revisions in the project plans or proposals (made by or agreed to) mitigate the potentially significant effects to a less-than-significant level, a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared instead of an EIR [CEQA Guidelines §15070(b)]. The lead agency prepares a written statement describing the reasons a proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, why an EIR need not be prepared. This IS/MND conforms to the content requirements under CEQA Guidelines §15071.

1.2 LEAD AGENCY

The lead agency is the public agency with primary approval authority over the proposed project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15051(b)(1), "the lead agency will normally be an agency with general governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an agency with a single or limited purpose." The lead agency for the proposed project is California State Parks. The contact person for the lead agency is:

Tina Robinson, Environmental Coordinator
California Department of Parks and Recreation
Southern Service Center
8885 Rio San Diego Drive, Suite 270
San Diego, California 92108
Phone: (619) 642-4200
Fax: (619) 220-5400

1.3 PURPOSE AND DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

Planning for the Cornfield site is occurring in two phases, the Interim Public Use phase and the General Plan phase. This project addresses the Interim Public Use phase only and all facilities constructed as a part of this phase are limited in scope and designed to be temporary in nature should the General Plan designate different or changed uses for the site. Preparation of the General Plan is ongoing. Public meetings were initiated in April of 2003 and are expected to continue in the fall of 2003. A separate environmental document for the General Plan will be prepared and circulated for public review in early 2004.

The purpose of this document is to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed Cornfield IPU project. The IPU project will enable the public to utilize the site during the planning phase for the General Plan and until capital outlay implementation occurs following the General Plan approval. Mitigation measures have also been incorporated into the project to eliminate any potentially significant impacts or reduce them to a less-than-significant level.

This document is organized as follows:

- Chapter 1 - Introduction.
  This chapter provides an introduction to the project and describes the purpose and organization of this document.

- Chapter 2 - Project Description.
  This chapter describes the reasons for the project, scope of the project, and project objectives.

- Chapter 3 - Environmental Setting, Initial Study/Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.
  This chapter explains the environmental setting for each environmental issue, identifies the significance of potential environmental impacts, and evaluates the potential impacts identified in the CEQA Environmental (Initial Study) Checklist. Where appropriate, mitigation measures are incorporated to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- Chapter 4 - Mandatory Findings of Significance
  This chapter identifies and summarizes the overall significance of any potential impacts to natural and cultural resources, cumulative impacts, and impacts to humans, as identified in the Initial Study.

- Chapter 5 – Project Alternatives
  This chapter summarizes the alternatives that were considered for this project.

- Chapter 6 - Summary of Mitigation Measures.
  This chapter summarizes the mitigation measures incorporated into the project as a result of the Initial Study.

- Chapter 7 - References.
  This chapter identifies the references and sources used in the preparation of this IS/MND. It also provides a list of those involved in the preparation of this document.

1.4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Chapter 3 of this document contains the Initial Study Checklist that identifies the potential environmental impacts (by environmental issue) and a brief discussion of each impact resulting from implementation of the proposed project.

Based on the IS and supporting environmental analysis provided in this document, the proposed Cornfield IPU Project will result in less-than-significant impacts for the following issues: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems.

In accordance with §15064(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, a MND shall be prepared if the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment after the inclusion of mitigation measures in the project. Based on the available project information and the environmental analysis presented in this document, there is no substantial evidence that, after the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed project will have a significant effect on the environment. It is proposed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines.

CHAPTER 2
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This IS/MND evaluates the environmental effects of the proposed Cornfield Interim Public Use project. All facilities are designed to be temporary in nature but with the ability to be included in the General Plan, as appropriate. This project will improve visitor services, improve public interpretation of the resource values, bring facilities into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and current codes, protect and improve cultural and natural resources and park aesthetics, and support continued use and maintenance of park facilities.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The 32-acre project site (See Figures 1 & 2) is located just northeast of Downtown Los Angeles on a long strip of land that tapers at each end. The site is bordered by North Spring Street on the southeast and on the northwest by the Gold Line light rail line, operated by the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority. The Chinatown Station on the Gold Line is located near the southwestern point of the property and the Los Angeles River runs beyond the northeastern end at the base of the historic North Broadway Bridge.

2.3 EXISTING FACILITIES AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT

The existing Cornfield site has undergone remediation for hazardous waste and is largely vacant. A temporary information site with several picnic tables and a small turf area has been placed on site and is open during the daylight hours, three days a week. The implementation of a park at Cornfield will play an important role in both in the urban revitalization of Los Angeles and the restoration of the Los Angeles River. The Interim Public Use project is the first phase of that vision. The site is located in one of the most park-poor neighborhoods in the most park-poor metropolitan area of the United States. The IPU project will open the site to park use and activities while the ultimate planning is finalized for the site.

2.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Implementation of the Interim Public Use Plan will provide an accessible state park for public enjoyment and utilization while the planning efforts continue to evolve. These interim facilities will provide public access in an area with few parks or places for quality outdoor experiences. Immediate implementation will provide open space and greenbelt areas for multiple uses that could include picnic areas, bike paths, walking trails, educational experiences, outdoor festivals or simply space to let children run and play.

2.5 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

California State Parks proposes to make the improvements described herein. Project maps and photographs are located at the end of the document. The following is a summary of the planned improvements:

State Park staff and their consultant have worked with the legislatively mandated Cornfield Advisory Group since July 2002 to develop:

- A recommendation to the Director of Sate Parks that portrays a long-term vision for the property.

- Input for the design of the Interim Public Use project

The design concept for the Interim Public Use project incorporates elements from the Cornfield Advisory Group "Vision" for the property as well as specific comments directed toward a draft concept for the IPU.

The proposed design concept is a linear pedestrian-oriented day-use park that runs the length of the property (approximately ¾ of a mile). The map showing this concept is located at the end of this IS/MND. The concept intends that the Cornfield project would serve as the "Front Porch" for the City of Los Angeles. Visually, the project site represents a large open space "porch" that fronts the majestic downtown skyline, this is especially true from the northern two thirds of the property and from the historic North Broadway Street Bridge. There are no other park sites that capture this welcoming view of the city. In fact, the City of Los Angeles recognizes this unique vantage point and is currently implementing plans to enhance North Spring Street as a grand "entry" into the downtown area. Once the City implements the North Spring Street enhancements, pedestrian and vehicular access to the Cornfield project will be possible from West Ann Street at a future traffic signal.

Socially, the project components are designed to serve in the same way that neighborhood porches have functioned across America for decades. The front porch was where families would rest and neighbors would gather. A number of diverse community groups surround the project site and these neighbors could gather together as they picnic, stroll through the park, attend performing arts, special events, and learn about and celebrate cultural groups of today and yesterday. The layout of the park will promote opportunities to tell the many stories that relate to the Cornfield project site. Through a variety of interpretive programs and media such as living history programs, special events, brochures and educational panels, the park will be used to tell the stories of the Native Americans (Tongva) that lived nearby and the early settlement and industrialization of Los Angeles. Water, transportation, and social history will be important components of this story.

A hard-surface or compacted walkway lined by native plantings would connect a number of "pocket-parks" of lawn and educational panels. A core use area is centrally located and includes a large lawn area, multi-purpose plaza, amphitheater, restrooms and off-street parking. Day-use facilities and amenities such as picnic tables, trash receptacles, hardened or compacted paths, multi-use event areas, a water feature, interpretive panels and exterior exhibits, lawn areas, landscaping, temporary restrooms, fencing, lighting and up to 30 parking spaces will be constructed and include accessible facilities. Construction of the project will monitored to impacts to historic foundations that remain. Therefore, up to 15,000 cubic yards of fill may be imported, utilizing approximately 1000 truckloads of material. The site may be

hydro-seeded with a mix of native and non-native plants and appropriate irrigation installed, primarily in the lawn areas.

2.6 PROJECT CONSTRUCTION

Project construction is anticipated to begin in December of 2003 and be completed and open to the public in the spring of 2004.

2.7 VISITATION TO CORNFIELD

Visitation to the Cornfield site is currently low because the temporary information site is only open on three weekdays and access restricted by temporary fencing. It is anticipated that the opening of the Gold Line and its Chinatown Station will provide easier access to the site once the Interim Public Use facilities are in place. Approximately 990,000 people live within a five-mile radius of the park and it will be readily accessible to millions of low-income, transit-dependent families, senior citizens, persons with disabilities and children.

2.8 CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL PLANS AND POLICIES

Opening of the Cornfield State Park project is part of a vision to create a 52-mile long Los Angeles River greenway. The City of Los Angeles and a coalition of thirty-five neighborhood, urban environmental, and social justice organizations support the creation of this new unit of the state park system. Governor Davis authorized the purchase and clean up of the property in 2001. The Governor also signed legislation that created the Cornfield State Park Advisory Committee which has been charged with presenting a prioritized list or recommendation for both interim and permanent land uses and facilities at the site. This project has been reviewe and obtained concurrence from the Committee.

2.9 DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

California State Parks has approval authority for this proposed project. The project may require consultation with the City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority for encroachment permits for access to and from the site.

2.10 RELATED PROJECTS

California State Parks has purchased the Taylor Yard site located approximately 2 miles to the north of the project site. Other park planning organizations, including the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (SMMC), are actively seeking to purchase additional property along the Los Angeles River corridor in order to create a system of parks in the urban core.

CHAPTER 3
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1 GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL DESCRIPTION

The Cornfield site is a ten-minute walk from City Hall and located adjacent to the first stop north, the Chinatown Station, from Union Station on the new Los Angels Metropolitan Transit Agency Gold Line light rail. The Cornfield project will be the most accessible park in one of the most the historic parts of the city. The site dates its human use from prehistoric times to the founding of the Spanish Era Pueblo through its key role in the commercial and industrial development of the City. The site served as the first transcontinental railroad yard and station in Los Angeles. As such it was a port of entry to many immigrants and they migrated to the surrounding neighborhoods. Immigrants from all over Central America and Mexico live today in the surrounding neighborhoods, including Solano Canyon to the west, across the river in Lincoln Heights and Boyle Heights to the north and east, and at the William Mead Homes to the south. Chinatown, located on the west side of Cornfield is home to immigrant Chinese, Vietnamese, and Cambodians today. Nearly one third of the residents live in poverty and have no access to a car. The greater community is widely diverse with 68% Latino, 14% Asian, 11% non-Hispanic white, and 4% African-American. There are a large number of children that live within a five-mile radius (approximately 283,000 of the 990,000 residents). The Castelar Elementary School with approximately 2,000 students is located within 1 mile of the site. Immediately to the southeast of North Spring Street is an industrial area.

3.1.1 AESTHETICS

The Cornfield site is vacant except for the small temporary information site. It is located in a deteriorated urban area that contains a number of visible historical features nearby and adjacent to the visually appealing new Chinatown Station. The view towards the downtown skyline is dramatic and unimpeded. At its northeast end the property terminates beneath the attractive arches of the historic North Broadway Street Bridge. The Gold Line light rail (with a backdrop of miscellaneous commercial development along Broadway) presents an unattractive scene along the northwest length of the property. Opposite this, North Spring Street is lined with stark industrial buildings. However, the City of Los Angeles is currently implementing plans to enhance North Spring Street with road realignments and landscape parkways. It will be a grand “entry” into the downtown area.

3.1.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

There are no existing agricultural resources at the Cornfield site.

3.1.3 AIR QUALITY

The City of Los Angeles is part of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD). The project site is located in a non-attainment area for ozone and PM10 standards. Air quality in the South Coast Air Basin has improved in recent years but readings taken at the nearby North Main Street monitoring station indicate that while the national standards for ozone has only been exceeded once in the last 2 years, the state average has been

exceeded 8 times. Nevertheless, these trends have lowered significantly from the early 1990's when the state threshold was exceeded 49 times for air quality.

3.1.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Cornfield parcel covers 32 acres and is located north of downtown and east of Chinatown in the City of Los Angeles. The parcel runs along the west-bank of the Los Angeles River, 300-325 feet above sea level. The watershed for the Los Angeles River runs from Glendale Blvd. down into South Central Los Angeles and the site is not considered within the 100-year floodplain. Water on the site drains to the northeast towards the Los Angeles River.

Although the Cornfield site is near the Los Angeles River it is in a highly urbanized and industrialized area of Los Angeles. Historically this site was used for early agricultural purposes then from 1875 until it was put up for sale in the early 1990's it served as a Southern Pacific railroad yard. Historical uses have kept this site devoid of natural vegetation. Currently site cleanup and remediation efforts have removed any vegetation and it currently contains no native plants or resident wildlife species. Due to it's proximity to the Los Angeles River this site may get the occasional wildlife visitor but site redevelopment would not be considered an impact to them and, in the long-term, beneficial.

There are no sensitive or rare natural resources expected to occur on site.

3.1.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Cornfield site sits uniquely at a vital geographic nexus to Los Angeles' history from its beginnings to the present. The property is located near the recorded site of the Tongva Native American village site of Yang-Na. A use that likely dated for several thousand years. Its historical period associations date to the early Spanish explorations and settlement of Alta California and the siting of the original Pueblo de Los Angeles, founded in 1781 (currently three blocks south of the project area). Shortly thereafter the main irrigation ditch (zanja madre) for the new community was built. This vital part of the original water system passed through the southern end of the project area and was utilized well into the 1890s. Elements of this historical resource feature are extant on the property adjacent to the project area. As such early use of the project property site was for agriculture and stock raising.

In the early 1870s local civic leaders chose the property to serve as the rail yard and depot for the Southern Pacific Railroad Company's new transcontinental railroad. The arrival of the transcontinental Southern Pacific line was instrumental in beginning the commercial, industrial, and economic rise of Los Angeles from its Nineteenth Century frontier existence into a dominant economic and social power in the Twentieth Century. Although the original depot, hotel, and rail shops were moved from the property in the early 1900s, rail use continued into the early 1990s when the remaining railroad structures were removed.

The project area's historical significance is therefore associated with the City of Los Angeles' early settlement, immigration of peoples and their historic occupancy, and commercial and industrial development. In 1971, the site's historical significance was recognized when the

City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission designated the project site as City Historical Cultural Monument #82, River Station Area/Southern Pacific Railroad.

Previous development proposals for the property as well as the development of the Gold Line light rail line triggered additional cultural resource studies at the site. These studies identified subsurface archaeological resources associated with the zanja madre and Southern Pacific Railroad (Romani et al. 2000; Horne 2000). After State Parks acquired the property in early 2002 work was commenced in concert with the Trust for Public Lands to remediate contaminated soils from the property. This triggered additional archaeological studies and monitoring and treatments for the remediation work. These studies identified additional archaeological features and deposits associated with Southern Pacific's activities and possibly early settlers and historic occupants. These sites have been recorded and are believed to eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (Larson 2002; Messick et al. 2003).

Potential above ground historic resources on the property include some original paving stones from the rail yard era and a small, circa 1953 vernacular lunchstand structure. The paving stones have been covered for their protection from theft and vandalism that had occurred prior to state parks ownership. The small lunchstand structure is in very poor condition and does possess any historical significance such that it would not currently be eligible for the National or California Registers of historic places.

3.1.6 GEOLOGY/SOILS

The project is located on a relatively flat parcel where the earth has been physically manipulated over the last 100 years. The original soil was probably alluvial given the close proximity of the river and the nearby hill that overlooks the site. The hills to the northwest where Dodger Stadium and Elysian Park are located contained natural canyons and drainages that were either filled (Chavez Ravine was largely filled for Dodger Stadium) or contain urban development such as Solano Canyon.

3.1.6 HAZARDS

Approximately 5,238 tons of soil contaminated with lead, arsenic and petroleum hydrocarbons was excavated and removed from the project site. In February of 2003, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control approved the soil remediation report and determined that the site is now suitable for park development. The groundwater beneath the site is still being investigated and/or remediated. The previous property owner, Union Pacific Railroad, is working with the Regional Water Quality Control Board on resolving the groundwater issues. Final site certification is expected once the groundwater investigation and remediation is completed.

3.1.8 HYDROLOGY

The site is located near the Los Angeles River and drains towards it during rain events. There are no wetland resources or natural drainages on the site but the historic Zanja Madre aqueduct was located on the site.

3.1.9 LAND USE & PLANNING

When Governor Davis authorized the purchase and implementation of the Cornfield State Park project, the legislation mandated that a Cornfield State Park Advisory Committee be formed. Thirty-six Committee members were appointed from a pool of over 100 applicants. The members represent a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, multi-class panel of community leaders affiliated with at least 63 different organizations interested in the future of the Cornfield site. The membership also represented interests from local neighbors, the broader community, regional, and statewide perspectives. There were five ex-officio representatives representing the state, county and city elected officials and the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, and one federal advisor from the National Park Service.

Active planning efforts in the project area include the Los Angeles County LA River Master Plan; the Los Angeles City Ad Hoc River committee; the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, the LA River bikeway and greenway planning efforts; the proposed Urban land Trust; the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA); the Los Angeles/San Gabriel River Watershed council; the Arroyo Seco bikeway plans; and the downtown revitalization efforts such as Disney Concert Hall, the Cathedral, Grand Avenue Cultural Arts Access and El Pueblo.

The project site was used for heavy industry as a railroad yard and was slated to become another industrial project prior to a grassroots campaign to develop other uses such as a park. Creation of a park is now the preferred land use. Adjacent to the Cornfield site is an industrial area and the Gold Line light rail and Chinatown Station along North Spring Street. A vacant strip of land, owned by the City of Los Angeles, runs along the entire southeastern edge of the property. The City of Los Angeles will utilize this strip of land in the future North Spring Street enhancement project. Several vacant, privately owned parcels are located between the Gold Line and Broadway to the northwest. The remainder of nearby land uses are a mix of industrial and commercial along Broadway with residential areas close by but removed from the immediate proximity of the park. There are also active planning efforts to repair and enhance the nearby existing historic features such as the successful 2001 North Broadway Street Bridge repair.

3.1.10 MINERALS

No regional mineral resources have been identified in or around the park.

3.1.10 NOISE

The project site is located between two busy thoroughfares and immediately adjacent to a light rail line. Urban daytime noise levels can be as high as 80 dBA or as low as 50 dBA. Since the Cornfield site is near busy transportation corridors and an industrial area, the ambient noise levels will tend to be higher during the business days and commute hours and lower on weekends.

3.1.12 POPULATION & HOUSING

The Cornfield site is located with the County of Los Angeles which has a population of 3,270,909 according to the 2000 census. This project will serve the residents of the urban core of Los Angeles and regional visitors from the County of Los Angeles. The park is located within the Central City North Community Plan within the City of Los Angeles. Within a 2.57 square mile study area, ethnic representation is approximately 36% Asian, 19% African-American, 34% Latino and 11% Caucasian. More than one in every three households in this area has children under the age of 19. There are distinct neighborhoods within this area such as Chinatown, where clear ethnic majorities exist.

3.1.13 PUBLIC SERVICES

Public Services currently exist at the Cornfield site due to its urban location. California State Parks currently provides maintenance of the temporary information site through a cooperative agreement. Police and Fire services are provided by the City of Los Angeles.

3.1.14 RECREATION

There is a temporary information site on the Cornfield site that is open Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. The site has several picnic tables, a turf area and interpretive panels. As previously stated, this portion of Los Angeles has very few recreational opportunities per capita. Elysian Park is located to the northwest across Broadway and Lincoln Park & Hazard Parks about I and I/2 mile to the east.

3.1.15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

The Metropolitan Transit Agency Gold Line traverses the northwest length of the property and, for the IPU project, restricts access from Broadway Street to the southwestern end of the property where the Chinatown Station provides access. North Spring Street and Broadway are both major arterials that carry high traffic volumes but at a generally good Level of Service (LOS). The last recorded weekday traffic volumes on North Spring Street were 15,276 on September 3, 1998 at Alpine Street, per the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation.

3.1.16 UTILITIES

Due to the project's urban location, all utilities are currently available and provided by the Los Angeles Department of Water & Power and the Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation. No utilities are know to cross the site.

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PROJECT INFORMATION	
1. Project Title:	Cornfield Interim Public Use Plan
2. Lead Agency Name & Address:	California Department of Parks and Recreation
3. Contact Person & Phone Number:	Tina Robinson, Environmental Coordinator (619) 220-5300
4. Project Location:	Los Angeles, California
5. Project Sponsor Name & Address:	Angeles District California Department of Parks & Recreation 39996 Pacific Coast Highway Malibu, California 90265
6. Designation:	State Park
7. Zoning:	Park Land/Open Space
8. Description of Project:	
9. Surrounding Land Uses & Setting:	Refer to (Section IX, Land Use Planning) in this chapter.
10. Approval Required from Other Public Agencies	

1. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below will be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact", as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☒ Aesthetics	☐ Agricultural Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☒ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Land Use/Planning
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Population/Housing
☐ Public Services	☒ Recreation	☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Utilities/Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	☒ None

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☐

I find that, although the original scope of the proposed project **COULD** have had a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect because revisions/mitigations to the project have been made by or agreed to by the applicant. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☒

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** or its functional equivalent will be prepared. ☐

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment. However, at least one impact has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described in the report's attachments. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the impacts not sufficiently addressed in previous documents. ☐

I find that, although the proposed project could have had a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, pursuant to applicable standards, and have been avoided or mitigated, pursuant to an earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, all impacts have been avoided or mitigated to a less-than-significant level and no further action is required. ☐

June 3, 2003
Date

Tina Robinson
Environmental Coordinator - Southern Service Center

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers, except "No Impact", that are adequately supported by the information sources cited. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact does not apply to the project being evaluated (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on general or project-specific factors (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must consider the whole of the project-related effects, both direct and indirect, including off-site, cumulative, construction, and operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether that impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate when there is sufficient evidence that a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change may occur in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project that cannot be mitigated below a level of significance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

4. A "Mitigated Negative Declaration" (Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated) applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures, prior to declaration of project approval, has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR (including a General Plan) or Negative Declaration [CCR, Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, § 15063(c)(3)(D)]. References to an earlier analysis should:

   a) Identify the earlier analysis and state where it is available for review.

   b) Indicate which effects from the environmental checklist were adequately analyzed in the earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether these effects were adequately addressed by mitigation measures included in that analysis.

   c) Describe the mitigation measures in this document that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and indicate to what extent they address site-specific conditions for this project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts into the checklist or appendix (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances, biological assessments). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include an indication of the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. A source list should be appended to this document. Sources used or individuals contacted should be listed in the source list and cited in the discussion.

8. Explanation(s) of each issue should identify:

   a) the criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate the significance of the impact addressed by each question **and**
   b) the mitigation measures, if any, prescribed to reduce the impact below the level of significance.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The Environmental Analysis (Initial Study) Checklist was prepared to assess the proposed project's potential impacts on the environment. The environmental settings for each topic are found in Section 3.1 above. Potential environmental impacts, identified by checklist point, are addressed in the discussion section. For each impact identified as "less than significant with mitigation", mitigation measures have been specified to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

I. AESTHETICS

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

DISCUSSION

a) The project will have a substantial beneficial impact on a scenic vista due to the creation of the Cornfield State Park as the “front porch” of the City of Los Angeles. The project will substantially lessen the urban blight in the area and create a nexus for other planned improvements.

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of interim public use development

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

* In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model for use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland.

DISCUSSION

a-c) the project is in an urban area where no existing agricultural resources are present.

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of interim public use development

III. AIR QUALITY

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan or regulation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., children, the elderly, individuals with compromised respiratory or immune systems)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

* Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make these determinations.

DISCUSSION

a-e) Landscaping associated with the project will provide a minor improvement in air quality at the park location. As discussed in the Existing Conditions, air quality thresholds are exceeded at the park site several times a year despite the trend towards improved air quality. During such conditions, outdoor activities at the park could expose persons attending to high levels of pollutants. However, these persons would be exposed to similar conditions nearby and the park would not be a pollutant generator. Vehicle trips to the park will be few because the park relies primarily on public transit or walking for access to the park. During high-level air pollution, a

smog advisory is announced to the public and is the responsibility of the local public health administrator.

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of the Interim Public Use project development.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a sensitive, candidate, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

DISCUSSION

a-f) No impacts are anticipated. The proposed redevelopment of one-half acre of this site is within local zoning and City of Los Angeles general planning requirements, therefore, temporary facilities are not in conflict with approved local policies regarding the protection of biological resources in the area. Landscaping as part of the establishment of temporary site facilities are too distant to cause adverse impacts to the River system. Temporary on site facilities will not impact federally protected wetlands through any direct or indirect means. Fill soils will be of similar composition to existing soils and stabilized to prevent erosion and sedimentation therefore, hydrological impacts are not expected to occur as a result of temporary facilities.

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of interim public use development. Native vegetation will be used in the landscaping for the project.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to§15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

DISCUSSION

a) The design for the project will be in conformance with the US Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Weeks and Grimmer, 1995) to be in compliance with both CEQA and the Public Resources Code 5024.5. No direct physical or indirect impacts will be made to known or buried cultural resources and therefore no result in any substantial adverse change to these potentially eligible resources.

b) The proposed project has been designed to avoid any existing ground surfaces whenever possible through the addition of imported fill and minimized footprint. No ground disturbance will occur in areas where historic research, geophysical and archaeological testing have identified that potentially eligible features and deposits exist or many exist.

TREATMENT/MITIGATION MEASURES
Avoidance of any potential resources in project design and implementation is considered an appropriate treatment under the US Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines for Treatment of Historic Properties (Weeks and Grimmer 1995). In addition, the use of imported fill for areas with known or suspected buried resources will be used to minimize the potential for impact. No ground disturbance will occur in areas where historic research, geophyiscal and archaeological testing have identified that potentially eligible features and deposits exist or may exist. Qualified archaeological monitors will be present for any construction tasks that would require ground disturbance to assure that no impacts occur to unknown resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that will become unstable, as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems, where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

DISCUSSION

a-f) The site is located in Los Angeles, a seismically active area. However, there will be very little exposure since the site is located outside and the project proposes no substantial structures. Since the earth on the site was previously manipulated, there are no unique geological features nor are there paleontological resources that would be impacted.

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of interim public use development

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials, substances, or waste into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport? If so, will the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, will the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildland fires, including areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	☒

DISCUSSION

a-h) Hazardous waste at the project site has been remediated and determined safe for park use by the California Department of Toxic Substance Control.

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of interim public use development

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, such that there will be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells will drop to a level that will not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which will result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which will result in on- or off-site flooding?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water which will exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Place structures that will impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from flooding, including flooding resulting from the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

DISCUSSION

a-j) The creation of the park for the Interim Public Use will not cause significant adverse effects to water quality or drainage patterns. The introduction of fill material will change the sheet flow drainage patterns towards the Los Angeles River but the introduction of landscaping will greater reduce the velocity of and siltation within the flows during storm events.

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of interim public use development.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

DISCUSSION

a-c) The establishment of an Interim Public Use for the Cornfield project will bring an immediate public benefit to the area while General Plan planning is ongoing. The Interim Public Use plan is consistent with planning for the area and will not adversely affect existing land uses.

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of interim public use development.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is or will be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

DISCUSSION

a) There are no mineral resources present on the site. The earth on the site has been used as a railroad yard and other historical uses. No mitigation is proposed.

XI. NOISE

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Generate or expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Generate or expose people to excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project (above levels without the project)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project, in excess of noise levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport? If so, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

DISCUSSION

a,-f) The site is located in an urban area adjacent to two heavily used city streets and the Gold Line light rail line. These are the primary noise generators although the industrial area to the southeast may also generate noise. People utilizing the park will be exposed to these noise levels that may be up to 80 dBA at peak times. During weekends and evenings, these noise levels should go down with reduced commuting and other business activities. Sensitive noise receptors such as homes, schools, other parks or wildlife refuges are not located near the project site. Activities at the park itself may generate noise from excited voices, music or loudspeakers (up to 80 dBA) during special events or pick-up sports activities. Since there are no sensitive receptors, there would be no new significant adverse impact associated with the propose project.

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of interim public use development.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

WILL THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

DISCUSSION

a-c) The proposed project will not adversely affect population or housing but will provide a benefit to those that live nearby and have campaigned extensively for the implementation of the Cornfield State Park.

Lower income and minority populations are generally underrepresented for public parks. Therefore the proposed project provides needed park facilities and interpretive values that can be utilized by nearby residents and schools improving any disproportionate park representation in the local area.

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of the Interim Public Use project development.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

WILL THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Result in significant environmental impacts from construction associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	☐	☐	☒	☐
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

DISCUSSION

a) The creation of a park at Cornfield will create a need for additional park maintenance that has been incorporated into the project planning. It may also create a need for additional law enforcement depending on whether or not there is a strong public presence at the park. Parks that are "owned" by their communities tend to have less maintenance and law enforcement needs because there is a tendency for the neighborhood to protect it from vandalism. State Park rangers are law enforcement officers and State Parks will coordinate with the City of Los Angeles for police and fire services at the park.

TREATMENT/MITIGATION MEASURES
California State Parks will coordinate with the City of Los Angeles for police and fire protection at the Cornfield State Park and provide rangers, as needed, on site. California State Parks will be responsible for maintenance activities at the park and budget accordingly.

XIV. RECREATION

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility will occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

DISCUSSION

a) The implementation of the Interim Public Use plan will provide needed park facilities in a park-poor community. The recreational facilities constructed as part of the IPU have the potential to adversely affect a significant historical archaeological site but the IPU design avoids significant adverse impacts to the resources (Please see Section V, Cultural Resources).

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of interim public use development.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

WILL THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Cause a substantial increase in traffic, in relation to existing traffic and the capacity of the street system (i.e., a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exceed, individually or cumulatively, the level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Contain a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or a dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) that will substantially increase hazards?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

DISCUSSION

a-f) The project only proposes up to 30 new parking spaces and serves a community that contains many transit-dependent residents. Therefore, although there will be a slight impact, it is not anticipated that there would any significant adverse effect on the traffic on North Spring Street. The existing entrance will be used until such time that the City implements it's North Spring Street enhancement project, then the entrance would be changed and allow additional safe pedestrian access across North Spring Street and a new vehicular access. Sight distance along N. Spring Street is good and should not affect the safety of the ingress and egress to the park. The primary pedestrian access to the site for the Interim Public Use project will be from the Gold Line Chinatown Station. There will be access from bus transit and Broadway Street at the Gold Line Station as well providing excellent access to Gold Line riders and transit-dependent community members.

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of interim public use development.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment restrictions or standards of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Will the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Will the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in a determination, by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to service the project's anticipated demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations as they relate to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

DISCUSSION

a-g) The Cornfield IPU will not adverse affect any utility provider. The site is located in an urban area that has utility connections available from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and Bureau of Sanitation. The needs for the project are nominal compared to the service area.

Mitigation is not required or recommended, as adverse direct or indirect impacts are not expected to occur at the Cornfield site as a result of interim public use development.

CHAPTER 4
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probably future projects?)	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

DISCUSSION

a) The project is located on an urban parcel that was previously used for industrial use. There is no habitat present and there will be no adverse effects on plant or wildlife communities.

b) The project site is very important in the early development of the City of Los Angeles. There are remnants and foundations of previous historic structures at numerous locations throughout the property. The proposed project will incorporate the U.S. Secretary of the Interior Standards and Guidelines for Historic Properties in the design and project construction. Ground disturbance in the area of recorded historic features will be minimized and monitored by a qualified cultural resource expert. It is anticipated that the care shown in the design will protect the buried historic features and mitigate the potential impacts of the Cornfield IPU project to a level below significance.

c) There will be positive, not adverse cumulative environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the Cornfield IPU and other projects located along the Los Angeles Riverby providing parks in a park-poor region of the city.

d) The project will result in positive environmental effects on humans by providing a place for park activities and enjoyment.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The Environmental Analysis (Initial Study) Checklist was prepared to assess the proposed project's potential impacts on the environment. The environmental settings for each topic are found in Section 3.1 above. Potential environmental impacts, identified by checklist point, are addressed in the discussion section. For each impact identified as "less than significant with mitigation", mitigation measures have been specified to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

DISCUSSION

Because the Cornfield IPU project will provide needed public recreation and interpretation in an urban area that is park-poor, it is anticipated that the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the will be beneficial. Significant historical archaeological resources are present on the site and will be capped with fill material or left in an undisturbed condition. Therefore, it is the determination of the California Department of Parks and Recreation that the project cannot have a significant affect on the environment, provided that the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines for historic properties, and other mitigation proposed are followed.

CHAPTER 5
PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

California State Parks and the Cornfield State Park Advisory Committee developed a set of ideas and vision scenarios for the site. For the ultimate use of the site, these visions are still under development as of June 2003. In consultation with California State Parks' personnel, including Field Operations management, designers and cultural resource specialists, the Cornfield Advisory Committee developed an vision for the Interim Public Use based on a consensus. Many diverse visions were presented that included regulation sports fieldsand other activities.

CHAPTER 6
SUMMARY OF TREATMENT/MITIGATION MEASURES

The following treatment/mitigation measures will be implemented by California State Parks as part of the Cornfield IPU Project.

Cultural Resources Mitigation:

- Avoidance of any potential resources in project design and implementation is considered an appropriate treatment under the US Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines for Treatment of Historic Properties (Weeks and Grimmer 1995). In addition, the use of imported fill for areas with known or suspected buried resources will be used to minimize the potential for impact.

- No ground disturbance will occur in areas where historic research, geophyiscal and archaeological testing have identified that potentially eligible features and deposits exist or may exist. Qualified archaeological monitors will be present for any construction tasks that would require ground disturbance to assure that no impacts occur to unknown resources.

Public Services Mitigation:

- California State Parks will coordinate with the City of Los Angeles for police and fire protection at the Cornfield State Park and provide rangers, as needed, on site.
- California State Parks will be responsible for maintenance activities at the park and budget accordingly.

CHAPTER 7
REFERENCES

"*A Unified Vision for Cornfield State Park*" Cornfield State Park Advisory Committee, April 2003

"Archaeological Monitor Report Historic Cornfield Railroad Yard" Greenwood and Associates, February 25, 2003.

The 2002 California Almanac of Emissions and Air Quality, California Air Resources Board, May 10, 2002.

City of Los Angeles, Department of Transportation, personal contact.

"Comparative Sound Levels Table", Common Indoor and Outdoor Noise Levels, California Department of Transporation, District 11.

REPORT PREPARATION

Jeff Brown
Landscape Architect
Southern Service Center

Brenda McMillan
Associate Resource Ecologist
Southern Service Center

Michelle Fredrickson
Research Assistant
Environmental Review
Southern Service Center

Tina Robinson
Associate Park and Rec Specialist
Environmental Review
Southern Service Center

Karen Miner
Senior resource Ecologist
Southern Service Center

Jim Newland
State Historian III
Cultural ResourcesSupervisor
Southern Service Center

MAPS/FIGURES

PUBLIC COMMENT